

A generalization of Pardue's formula.

by

Mircea Cimpoeaş

Abstract

In this paper, we introduce a new class of monomial ideals, called $\mathbf{d}$ -fixed ideals, which generalize the class of p -Borel ideals and show how some results for p -Borel ideals can be transferred to this new class. In particular, we give the form of a principal $\mathbf{d}$ -fixed ideal and we compute the socle of factors of these ideals, using methods similar as in [3]. This allowed us to give a generalization of Pardue's formula, i.e. a formula of the regularity for a principal $\mathbf{d}$ -fixed ideal.

Keywords: p -Borel ideals, Betti numbers, Mumford-Castelnuovo regularity.

2000 Mathematics Subject Classification: Primary: 13P10, Secondary: 13D25, 13D02, 13H10.

Introduction.

A p -Borel ideal is a monomial ideal which satisfies certain combinatorial conditions, where $p > 0$ is a prime number. It is well known that any positive integer a has a unique p -adic decomposition $a = \sum_{i \geq 0} a_i p^i$. If a, b are two positive integers, we write $a \leq_p b$ iff $a_i \leq b_i$ for any i , where $a = \sum_{i \geq 0} a_i p^i$ and $b = \sum_{i \geq 0} b_i p^i$. We say that a monomial ideal $I \subset S = k[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ is p -Borel if for any monomial $u \in I$ and for any indices $j < i$, if $t \leq_p \nu_i(u)$ then $x_j^t u / x_i^t \in I$, where $\nu_i(u) = \max\{k : x_i^k | u\}$.

This definition suggests a natural generalization. The idea is to consider a strictly increasing sequence of positive integers $\mathbf{d} : 1 = d_0 | d_1 | \dots | d_s$, which we called a $\mathbf{d}$ -sequence. Lemma 1.1 states that for any positive integer a , there exists a unique decomposition $a = \sum_{t=0}^s a_t d_t$. If a, b are two positive integers, we write $a \leq_{\mathbf{d}} b$ iff $a_i \leq b_i$ for any i , where $a = \sum_{i \geq 0} a_i d_i$ and $b = \sum_{i \geq 0} b_i d_i$. We say that a monomial ideal I is $\mathbf{d}$ -fixed if for any monomial $u \in I$ and for any indices $j < i$, if $t \leq_{\mathbf{d}} \nu_i(u)$ then $x_j^t u / x_i^t \in I$. Obviously, the p -Borel ideals are a special case of $\mathbf{d}$ -fixed ideals for $\mathbf{d} : 1 | p | p^2 | \dots$.

A principal $\mathbf{d}$ -fixed ideal, is the smallest $\mathbf{d}$ -fixed ideal which contains a given monomial. 1.6 and 1.8 give the explicit form of a principal $\mathbf{d}$ -fixed ideal. In the second section we compute the socle of factors for a principal $\mathbf{d}$ -fixed ideal (2.1 and 2.4). The proofs are similar as in [3] but we consider that is necessary to present them in this context. In the third section we give a formula (3.1) for the regularity of a $\mathbf{d}$ -fixed ideal, which generalizes the Pardue's formula for the regularity of principal p -Borel ideals, proved by Aramova-Herzog [1] and Herzog-Popescu [4]. Using a theorem of Popescu [6] we compute the extremal Betti numbers of S/I (3.3). Also, we show that if I is a principal $\mathbf{d}$ -fixed ideal generated by the power of a variable, then $I_{\geq e}$ is stable for any $e \geq \text{reg}(I)$ (3.6), so $\text{reg}(I) = \min\{e \geq$

¹This paper was supported by the CEEEX Program of the Romanian Ministry of Education and Research, Contract CEX05-D11-11/2005.

$\deg(I) : I_{\geq e} \text{ is stable} \}$ (3.9). Thus a result of Eisenbud-Reeves-Totaro [2, Proposition 12] holds also in this frame.

The author wish to thanks to his Ph.D.advisor, Professor Dorin Popescu, for support, encouragement and valuables observations on the contents of this paper.

1 **d**-fixed ideals.

In the following $\mathbf{d} : 1 = d_0 | d_1 | \cdots | d_s$ is a strictly increasing sequence of positive integers. We say that $\mathbf{d}$ is a **d**-sequence.

Lemma 1.1. *Let $\mathbf{d}$ be a **d**-sequence. Then, for any $a \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists an unique sequence of positive integers $a_0, a_1, \dots, a_s$ such that:*

1. $a = \sum_{t=0}^s a_t d_t$ and
2. $0 \leq a_t < \frac{d_{t+1}}{d_t}$, for any $0 \leq t < s$.

*Conversely, if $\mathbf{d} : 1 = d_0 < d_1 < \cdots < d_s$ is a sequence of positive integers such that for any $a \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists an unique sequence of positive integers $a_0, a_1, \dots, a_s$ as before, then $\mathbf{d}$ is a **d**-sequence.*

Proof. Let a_s be the quotient of a divided by d_s . For $0 \leq t < s$ let a_t be the quotient of $(a - q_{t+1})$ divided by d_t , where $q_{t+1} = \sum_{j=t+1}^s a_j d_j$. We will prove that $a_0, a_1, \dots, a_s$ fulfill the required conditions. Indeed, it is obvious that $a = \sum_{t=0}^s a_t d_t$. On the other hand, $a - q_{t+1} < d_{t+1}$, since $a - q_{t+1}$ is $a - q_{t+2}$ modulo d_{t+1} . Therefore, since a_t is the quotient of $(a - q_{t+1})$ divided by d_t , it follows that $a_t < \frac{d_{t+1}}{d_t}$.

Suppose there exists another decomposition $a = \sum_{j=0}^s b_j d_j$ which also fulfill the conditions 1 and 2. Then, we may assume that there exists an integer $0 \leq t \leq s$ such that $b_s = a_s, \dots, b_{t+1} = a_{t+1}$ and $b_t > a_t$. Notice that $d_t > \sum_{j=0}^{t-1} a_j d_j$. Indeed,

$$\sum_{j=0}^{t-1} a_j d_j \leq \sum_{j=0}^{t-1} \left(\frac{d_{j+1}}{d_j} - 1 \right) d_j = (d_1 - d_0) + (d_2 - d_1) + \cdots + (d_t - d_{t-1}) = d_t - 1 < d_t.$$

We have $0 = \sum_{j=0}^s (b_j - a_j) d_j = \sum_{j=0}^t (b_j - a_j) d_j$, but on the other hand:

$$(b_t - a_t) d_t \geq d_t > \sum_{j=0}^{t-1} a_j d_j \geq \sum_{j=0}^{t-1} (a_j - b_j) d_j$$

and therefore $(b_t - a_t) d_t - \sum_{j=0}^{t-1} (a_j - b_j) d_j = \sum_{j=0}^t (b_j - a_j) d_j > 0$, which is a contradiction.

For the converse, we use induction on $0 \leq t < s$, the assertion being obvious for $t = 0$. Suppose $t > 0$ and $d_0 | d_1 | \cdots | d_t$ and consider the decomposition of $d_{t+1} - 1$. Since

$d_{t+1} - 1 < d_{t+1}$, it follows that $d_{t+1} - 1 = \sum_{j=0}^t a_j d_j$. On the other hand, since $d_{t+1} - 1$ is the largest integer less than d_{t+1} , each a_j is maximal between the integers $< d_{j+1}/d_j$, for $j < t$. Therefore $a_j = d_{j+1}/d_j - 1$ for $0 \leq j < t$. Thus:

$$\begin{aligned} d_{t+1} &= 1 + d_{t+1} - 1 = 1 + a_0 d_0 + a_1 d_1 + \cdots + a_t d_t = d_1 + a_1 d_1 + a_2 d_2 + \cdots + a_t d_t = \\ &= d_2 + a_2 d_2 + \cdots + a_t d_t = \cdots = (a_t + 1) d_t, \text{ so } d_t | d_{t+1}. \end{aligned}$$

□

Definition 1.2. Let a, b be two positive integers and consider the $\mathbf{d}$ -decompositions $a = \sum_{j=0}^s a_j d_j$ and $b = \sum_{j=0}^s b_j d_j$. We say that $a \leq_{\mathbf{d}} b$ if $a_i \leq b_i$ for any $0 \leq i \leq s$.

Lemma 1.3. Let a, b be two positive integers with $a \leq_{\mathbf{d}} b$. Suppose $b = b' + b''$, where b' and b'' are positive integers. Then, there exists some positive integers $a' \leq_{\mathbf{d}} b'$ and $a'' \leq_{\mathbf{d}} b''$ such that $a = a' + a''$.

Proof. Let $a = \sum_{t=0}^s a_t d_t$, $b = \sum_{t=0}^s b_t d_t$, $b' = \sum_{t=0}^s b'_t d_t$, $b'' = \sum_{t=0}^s b''_t d_t$. The hypothesis implies $a_t \leq b_t < d_{t+1}/d_t$ and $b'_t, b''_t < d_{t+1}/d_t$ for any $0 \leq t < s$. We construct the sequences a'_t, a''_t using decreasing induction on t . Suppose we have already defined a'_j, a''_j for $j > t$ such that $\sum_{i=j}^s (a'_i + a''_i) d_i = \sum_{i=j}^s a_i d_i$ and $b_{t+1} = b'_{t+1} + b''_{t+1}$. This is obvious for $t = s$.

We consider two cases. If $b_t = b'_t + b''_t$, then we choose $a'_t \leq b'_t$ and $a''_t \leq b''_t$ such that $a'_t + a''_t = a_t$. We can do this, because $a_t \leq b_t$. Also, it is obvious from the induction hypothesis that $\sum_{i=t}^s (a'_i + a''_i) d_i = \sum_{i=t}^s a_i d_i$, so we can pass from t to $t - 1$.

If $b_t \neq b'_t + b''_t$ we claim that $b'_t + b''_t = b_t - 1$. Indeed, $\sum_{j=0}^{t-1} (b'_j + b''_j) d_j < 2d_t$ and therefore it is impossible to have $b'_t + b''_t \leq b_t - 2$, otherwise $\sum_{j=0}^t (b'_j + b''_j) d_j < b_t d_t$ and we contradict the equality $b = b' + b''$. Also, since $b'_{t+1} + b''_{t+1} = b_{t+1}$, we cannot have $b'_t + b''_t > b_t$. Similarly we get $b'_{t-1} + b''_{t-1} > b_{t-1}$. By recurrence, we conclude that there exists an integer $u < t$ such that: $b'_{u-1} + b''_{u-1} = b_{u-1}$, $b'_u + b''_u = b_u + d_{u+1}/d_u$, $b'_{u+1} + b''_{u+1} = b_{u+1} + d_{u+2}/d_{u+1} - 1$, $\dots$, $b'_{t-1} + b''_{t-1} = b_{t-1} + d_t/d_{t-1} - 1$.

If $a_j = b_j$ for any $j \in \{u, \dots, t\}$, we simply choose $a'_j = b'_j$ and $a''_j = b''_j$ for any $j \in \{u, \dots, t\}$ and the required conditions are fulfilled, so we can pass from t to $u - 1$. If this is not the case, then there exists an integer $u \leq q \leq t$ such that $a_t = b_t, \dots, a_{q+1} = b_{q+1}$ and $a_q < b_q$. If $q = t$ then for any $j \in \{u, \dots, t\}$ we can choose $a'_j \leq b'_j$ and $a''_j \leq b''_j$ such that $a'_j + a''_j = a_j$. For $j < t$ the previous assertion is obvious because $b'_j + b''_j \geq b_j$, and for $j = t$, since $a_t < b_t$ we have in fact $a_t \leq b'_t + b''_t = b_t - 1$ and therefore we can choose again a'_t and a''_t . The conditions are satisfied so we can pass from t to $u - 1$.

Suppose $q < t$. For $j \in \{u, \dots, q - 1\}$ we choose $a'_j \leq b'_j$ and $a''_j \leq b''_j$ such that $a'_j + a''_j = a_j$. We can do this because $b'_j + b''_j \geq b_j \geq a_j$. We choose a'_q and a''_q such that $a'_q + a''_q = a_q + d_{q+1}/d_q$. We can make this choice, because $a_q \leq b_q - 1$ and $b'_q + b''_q \geq b_q + d_{q+1}/d_q - 1$. For $j > q$, we simply put $a'_j = b'_j$ and $a''_j = b''_j$. To pass from t to $u - 1$ is enough to see that $\sum_{j=u}^t a_j d_j = \sum_{j=u}^t (a'_j + a''_j) d_j$. Indeed,

$$\sum_{j=u}^t (a'_j + a''_j) d_j = \sum_{j=u}^{q-1} (a'_j + a''_j) d_j + (a'_q + a''_q) d_q + \sum_{j=q+1}^t (a'_j + a''_j) d_j =$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \sum_{j=u}^{q-1} a_j d_j + (a_q + d_{q+1}/d_q) d_q + \sum_{j=q+1}^{t-1} (a_j + d_{j+1}/d_j - 1) d_j + (a_t - 1) d_t = \\
&= \sum_{j=u}^t a_j d_j + d_{q+1} + \sum_{j=q+1}^{t-1} (d_{j+1} - d_j) - d_t = \sum_{j=u}^t a_j d_j,
\end{aligned}$$

The induction ends when $t = -1$. Finally, we obtain a' and a'' such that $a' + a'' = a$, $a'_t \leq b'_t$ and $a''_t \leq b''_t$, as required. $\square$

Definition 1.4. We say that a monomial ideal $I \subset S = k[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ is **d**-fixed, if for any monomial $u \in I$ and for any indices $1 \leq j < i \leq n$, if $t \leq_{\mathbf{d}} \nu_i(u)$ (where $\nu_i(u)$ denotes the exponent of the variable x_i in u) then $u \cdot x_j^t / x_i^t \in I$.

Notice that if $\mathbf{d} : 1|p|p^2|p^3| \dots$ then I is a p -Borel ideal.

Definition 1.5. A **d**-fixed ideal I is called principal if it is generated, as a **d**-fixed ideal by one monomial u , i.e. I is the smallest **d**-fixed ideal which contain u . We write $I = \langle u \rangle_{\mathbf{d}}$. More generally, if $u_1, \dots, u_r \in S$ are monomials, the **d**-fixed ideal generated by $u_1, \dots, u_r$ is the smallest **d**-fixed ideal I which contains $u_1, \dots, u_r$. We write $I = \langle u_1, \dots, u_r \rangle_{\mathbf{d}}$.

Our next goal is to describe the principal **d**-fixed ideals. The easiest case is when we have a **d**-fixed ideal generated by the power of a variable. Denote $\mathbf{m} = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$ and $\mathbf{m}^{[d]} = (x_1^d, \dots, x_n^d)$ for some nonnegative integer d . We have the following proposition.

Proposition 1.6. If $u = x_n^\alpha$, then $I = \langle u \rangle_{\mathbf{d}} = \prod_{t=0}^s (\mathbf{m}^{[d_t]})^{\alpha_t}$, where $\alpha = \sum_{t=0}^s \alpha_t d_t$.

Proof. Let $I' = \prod_{t=0}^s (\mathbf{m}^{[d_t]})^{\alpha_t}$. The minimal generators of I' are monomials of the type $w = \prod_{t=0}^s \prod_{j=1}^n x_j^{\lambda_{tj} \cdot d_t}$, where $0 \leq \lambda_{tj}$ and $\sum_{j=1}^n \lambda_{tj} = \alpha_t$. First, let us show that $I' \subset I$. In order to do this, we choose w a minimal generator of I' (the one bellow). We write x_n^α like this: $x_n^\alpha = x_n^{\alpha_0 d_0 + \alpha_1 d_1 + \dots + \alpha_s d_s} = x_n^{\alpha_0 d_0} \cdot x_n^{\alpha_1 d_1} \dots x_n^{\alpha_s d_s}$. Since $\lambda_{01} d_0 \leq_{\mathbf{d}} \alpha_0 d_0 + \alpha_1 d_1 + \dots + \alpha_s d_s$ and I is **d**-fixed it follows that $x_1^{\lambda_{01} d_0} x_n^{\alpha_0 d_0 - \lambda_{01} d_0} \in I$. Also, $\lambda_{02} d_0 < \alpha_0 d_0 + \alpha_1 d_1 + \dots + \alpha_s d_s$, and since I is **d**-fixed it follows that $x_1^{\lambda_{01} d_0} x_2^{\lambda_{02} d_0} x_n^{\alpha_0 d_0 - \lambda_{01} d_0 - \lambda_{02} d_0} \in I$. Using iteratively this argument, one can easily see that $x_1^{\lambda_{01} d_0} \dots x_n^{\lambda_{0n} d_0} x_n^{\alpha_0 d_0 - \sum_{j=1}^n \lambda_{0j} d_0} \in I$. Also $\alpha_0 d_0 = \alpha_1 d_1 + \dots + \alpha_n d_n$. Again, using an inductive argument, we get:

$$(x_1^{\lambda_{01} d_0} \dots x_n^{\lambda_{0n} d_0}) \cdot (x_1^{\lambda_{11} d_1} \dots x_n^{\lambda_{1n} d_1}) \dots (x_1^{\lambda_{s1} d_s} \dots x_n^{\lambda_{sn} d_s}) = w \in I.$$

For the converse, i.e. $I \subset I'$, is enough to verify that I' is **d**-fixed. In order to do this, is enough to prove that the minimal generators of I' fulfill the definition of a **d**-fixed ideal. Let w be a minimal generator of I' . Let $2 \leq i \leq n$. Then $\nu_i(w) = \sum_{t=0}^s \lambda_{ti} d_t$. If $\beta \leq_{\mathbf{d}} \nu_i(w)$ then $\beta = \sum_{t=0}^s \beta_t d_t$ with $\beta_t \leq \lambda_{ti}$. Let $1 \leq k < i$. We have

$$w \cdot x_k^\beta / x_i^\beta = \prod_{t=0}^s \left(\prod_{j \neq i, k} x_j^{\lambda_{tj} d_t} \right) \cdot x_i^{(\lambda_{ti} - \beta_t) d_t} \cdot x_k^{(\lambda_{tk} + \beta_t) d_t}.$$

Thus $w \cdot x_k^\beta / x_i^\beta \in I'$ and therefore I' is **d**-fixed. Since I is the smallest **d**-fixed ideal which contains x_n^α it follows that $I \subset I'$. $\square$

Proposition 1.7. *If $\alpha \leq \beta$ then $\langle x_n^\beta \rangle_{\mathbf{d}} \subseteq \langle x_n^\alpha \rangle_{\mathbf{d}}$.*

Proof. The case $\alpha = \beta$ is obvious, so we may assume $\alpha < \beta$. We denote $I = \langle x_n^\alpha \rangle_{\mathbf{d}}$ and $I' = \langle x_n^\beta \rangle_{\mathbf{d}}$. We write $\alpha = \sum_{t=0}^s \alpha_t d_t$ and $\beta = \sum_{t=0}^s \beta_t d_t$. If w is a minimal generator of I' then $w = \prod_{t=0}^s \prod_{i=1}^n x_i^{\lambda_{ti} d_t}$, where $0 \leq \lambda_{ti}$ and $\sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_{ti} = \beta_t$. We claim that $w \in I$ and therefore $I' \subset I$ as required.

Since $\alpha < \beta$ there exists $t \in \{0, \dots, s\}$ such that $\alpha_s = \beta_s, \dots, \alpha_{t+1} = \beta_{t+1}$ and $\alpha_t < \beta_t$. We may assume $\lambda_{t1} > 0$. We have

$$w = \prod_{j=0}^s \prod_{i=1}^n x_i^{\lambda_{ji} d_j} = \prod_{j=0}^{t-1} x_1^{\alpha_j d_j} x_1^{(\lambda_{t1}-1)d_t} x_1^{d_t - \sum_{j=0}^{t-1} \alpha_j d_j} \prod_{i=2}^n x_i^{\lambda_{ti} d_t} \prod_{j>t}^s \prod_{i=1}^n x_i^{\lambda_{ji} d_j}$$

and now it is obvious that $w \in I$. $\square$

We have the general description of a principal $\mathbf{d}$ -fixed ideal given by the following proposition. In the proof, we will apply Lemma 1.3.

Proposition 1.8. *Let $1 \leq i_1 < i_2 < \dots < i_r = n$ and let $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_r$ be some positive integers. If $u = x_{i_1}^{\alpha_1} x_{i_2}^{\alpha_2} \dots x_{i_r}^{\alpha_r}$ then:*

$$I = \langle u \rangle_{\mathbf{d}} = \langle x_{i_1}^{\alpha_1} \rangle_{\mathbf{d}} \cdot \langle x_{i_2}^{\alpha_2} \rangle_{\mathbf{d}} \cdots \langle x_{i_r}^{\alpha_r} \rangle_{\mathbf{d}} = \prod_{q=1}^r \prod_{t=0}^s (\mathbf{m}_q^{[d_t]})^{\alpha_{qt}},$$

where $\mathbf{m}_q = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{i_q})$ and $\alpha_q = \sum_{t=0}^s \alpha_{qt} d_t$.

Proof. Let $I' = \prod_{q=1}^r \prod_{t=0}^s (\mathbf{m}_q^{[d_t]})^{\alpha_{qt}}$. The minimal generators of I' are monomials of the type $w = \prod_{q=1}^r \prod_{t=0}^s \prod_{j=1}^{i_q} x_j^{\lambda_{qtj} d_t}$, where $0 \leq \lambda_{qtj}$ and $\sum_{j=1}^{i_q} \lambda_{qtj} = \alpha_{qt}$. First, we show that $I' \subset I$. In order to do this, it is enough to prove that by iterative transformations we can modify u such that we obtain w .

The idea of this transformations is the same as in the proof of 1.6. Without given all the details, one can see that if we rewrite u as

$$(x_{i_1}^{\alpha_{10} d_0} x_{i_1}^{\alpha_{11} d_1} \dots x_{i_1}^{\alpha_{1s} d_s}) \cdots (x_{i_r}^{\alpha_{r0} d_0} x_{i_r}^{\alpha_{r1} d_1} \dots x_{i_r}^{\alpha_{rs} d_s}),$$

where $\alpha_q = \sum_{t=0}^s \alpha_{qt} d_t$, we can pass to w , using the transformations

$$x_{i_1}^{\alpha_{10} d_0} \mapsto \prod_{j=1}^{i_1} x_j^{\lambda_{10j} d_0}, \dots, x_{i_1}^{\alpha_{1s} d_s} \mapsto \prod_{j=1}^{i_1} x_j^{\lambda_{1sj} d_s}, \dots, x_{i_r}^{\alpha_{r0} d_0} \mapsto \prod_{j=1}^{i_r} x_j^{\lambda_{r0j} d_0}, \dots, x_{i_r}^{\alpha_{rs} d_s} \mapsto \prod_{j=1}^{i_r} x_j^{\lambda_{rsj} d_s}.$$

Therefore $w \in I$, and thus $I' \subset I$. For the converse, it is enough to see that I' is a $\mathbf{d}$ -fixed ideal. Let w be a minimal generator of I' . We choose an index $2 \leq i \leq n$. Then $\nu_i(w) = \sum_{q=1}^r \sum_{t=0}^s \lambda_{qti} d_t$. Let $\beta \leq \nu_i(w)$. Using Lemma 3.1, we can choose some positive integers $\beta_1, \dots, \beta_r$ such that:

$$(a) \beta = \sum_{q=1, i_q \geq i}^r \beta_q \text{ and } (b) \beta_q \leq \sum_{t=0}^s \lambda_{qti} d_t,$$

i.e. $\beta_{qt} \leq \lambda_{qti}$, where $\beta_q = \sum_{t=0}^s \beta_{qt} d_t$. Let $k < i$. Then,

$$w \cdot x_k^\beta / x_i^\beta = \prod_{q=1}^r \prod_{t=0}^s \left(\prod_{j=1, j \neq k, i}^{i_q} x_j^{\lambda_{qtj} \cdot d_t} \right) x_i^{(\lambda_{qti} - \beta_{qt}) d_t} x_k^{(\lambda_{qtk} + \beta_{qt}) d_t}.$$

Now, it is easy to see that $w \cdot x_k^\beta / x_i^\beta \in I'$, and therefore I' is $\mathbf{d}$ -fixed. $\square$

Example 1.9. Let $\mathbf{d} : 1|2|4|12$.

1. Let $u = x_3^{21}$. We have $21 = 1 \cdot 1 + 0 \cdot 2 + 2 \cdot 4 + 1 \cdot 12$. From 1.6, we get:

$$\langle u \rangle_{\mathbf{d}} = (x_1, x_2, x_3)(x_1^4, x_2^4, x_3^4)^2(x_1^{12}, x_2^{12}, x_3^{12}).$$

2. Let $u = x_1^2 x_2^9 x_3^{16}$. We have $9 = 1 \cdot 1 + 2 \cdot 4$ and $16 = 1 \cdot 4 + 1 \cdot 12$. From 1.8, we get

$$\langle u \rangle_{\mathbf{d}} = x_1^2 \langle x_2^9 \rangle_{\mathbf{d}} \langle x_3^{16} \rangle_{\mathbf{d}} = x_1^2 (x_1, x_2)(x_1^4, x_2^4)^2(x_1^4, x_2^4, x_3^4)(x_1^{12}, x_2^{12}, x_3^{12}).$$

Definition 1.10. We say that a monomial ideal $I \subset k[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ is a Borel type ideal if

$$I : x_j^\infty = I : (x_1, \dots, x_j)^\infty, \text{ for any } j = 1, \dots, n.$$

Proposition 1.11. Any $\mathbf{d}$ -fixed ideal I is a Borel type ideal.

Proof. Indeed, [3, Proposition 2.2] says that an ideal I is of Borel type if and only if for any $1 \leq j < i \leq n$, there exists a positive integer t such that $x_j^t(u/x_i^{\nu_i(u)}) \in I$. Choosing $t = \nu_i(u)$, is easy to see that the definition of a $\mathbf{d}$ -fixed ideal implies the condition above. $\square$

Definition 1.12. Let $S = k[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ and let M be a finitely generated graded S -module. The module M is sequentially Cohen-Macaulay if there exists a finite filtration $0 = M_0 \subset M_1 \subset \dots \subset M_r = M$ of M by graded submodules of M such that:

- M_i/M_{i-1} are Cohen-Macaulay for any $i = 1, \dots, r$ and
- $\dim(M_1/M_0) < \dim(M_2/M_1) < \dots < \dim(M_r/M_{r-1})$.

In particular, if $I \subset S$ is a graded ideal then $R = S/I$ is sequentially Cohen-Macaulay if there exists a chain of ideals $I = I_0 \subset I_1 \subset \dots \subset I_r = S$ such that I_j/I_{j-1} are Cohen-Macaulay and $\dim(I_j/I_{j-1}) < \dim(I_{j+1}/I_j)$ for any $j = 1, \dots, r-1$.

Remark 1.13. Let $I \subset S$ be a monomial ideal. Recursively we define an ascending chain of monomial ideals as follows: We let $I_0 := I$. Suppose I_ℓ is already defined. If $I_\ell = S$ then the chain ends. Otherwise, let $n_\ell = \max\{i : x_i | u \text{ for an } u \in G(I_\ell)\}$. We set $I_{\ell+1} := (I_\ell : x_{n_\ell}^\infty)$. It is obvious that $n_\ell > n_{\ell-1}$, and therefore the chain $I_0 \subset I_1 \subset \dots \subset I_r = S$ is finite and has length $r \leq n$. We call this chain of ideals, the sequential chain of I .

If I is a Borel type ideal, [3, Lemma 2.4] says that $I_{\ell+1} := I_\ell : (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{n_\ell})^\infty$. From [3, Corollary 2.5], it follows that $R = S/I$ is sequentially Cohen-Macaulay with the sequential chain $I_0 \subset I_1 \subset \dots \subset I_r = S$ defined above. Moreover $I_{\ell+1}/I_\ell \cong J_\ell^{\text{sat}}/J_\ell[x_{n_\ell+1}, \dots, x_n]$, where $J_\ell = I_\ell \cap k[x_1, \dots, x_{n_\ell}]$ and $J_\ell^{\text{sat}} = J_\ell : (x_1, \dots, x_{n_\ell})^\infty$.

Let $u = x_{i_1}^{\alpha_1} x_{i_2}^{\alpha_2} \dots x_{i_r}^{\alpha_r}$ and $I = \langle u \rangle_{\mathbf{d}} = \prod_{q=1}^r \prod_{t=0}^s (\mathbf{m}_q^{[d_t]})^{\alpha_{qt}}$, where $\mathbf{m}_q = (x_1, \dots, x_{i_q})$ and $\alpha_q = \sum_{t=0}^s \alpha_{qt} d_t$. Let $I_{r-e} = \prod_{q=1}^e \prod_{t=0}^s (\mathbf{m}_q^{[d_t]})^{\alpha_{qt}}$. Then $I = I_0 \subset I_1 \subset \dots \subset I_r = S$ is the sequential chain of I . Let $n_\ell = i_{q_{r-\ell}}$. Indeed, since $x_{n_\ell}^{\alpha_{r-e}} I_{\ell+1} \subset I_\ell \Rightarrow I_{\ell+1} \subset (I_\ell : x_{n_\ell}^\infty)$. For the converse, let $w \in (I_\ell : x_{n_\ell}^\infty)$ be any minimal generator. Then there exists an integer b such that $w \cdot x_{n_\ell}^b \in I_\ell$. We may assume that w is a minimal generator of I_ℓ . Then $w \cdot x_{n_\ell}^b = w' \cdot y$ for a $w' \in I_{\ell+1}$ and $y \in \prod_{j=0}^t (\mathbf{m}_{r-\ell}^{[d_j]})^{\alpha_{r-\ell,j}}$ with $x_{n_\ell}^b | y$. Thus $w' | w$, and therefore $w \in I_{\ell+1}$.

Let $S = k[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ and let M be a finitely graded generated S -module with the minimal graded free resolution $0 \rightarrow F_s \rightarrow F_{s-1} \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow F_0 \rightarrow M \rightarrow 0$. Let $\text{Syz}_t(M) = \text{Ker}(F_t \rightarrow F_{t-1})$. The module M is called (r, t) -regular if $\text{Syz}_t(M)$ is $(r+t)$ -regular in the sense that all generators of F_j for $t \leq j \leq s$ have degrees $\leq j+r$. The t -regularity of M is by definition $(t - \text{reg})(M) = \min\{r \mid M \text{ is } (r, t) - \text{regular}\}$.

Obvious $(t - \text{reg})(M) \leq ((t-1) - \text{reg})(M)$. If the equality is strict and $r = (t - \text{reg})(M)$ then (r, t) is called a corner of M and $\beta_{t, r+t}(M)$ is an extremal Betti number of M , where $\beta_{ij} = \dim_k \text{Tor}_i(k, M)_j$ denotes the ij -th graded Betti number of M . Later, we will use the following result:

Theorem 1.14. [6, Theorem 3.2] If $I \subset S$ is a Borel type ideal, then S/I has at most $r+1$ -corners among $(n_\ell, s(J_\ell^{\text{sat}}/J_\ell))$ and the corresponding extremal Betti numbers are

$$\beta_{n_\ell, s(J_\ell^{\text{sat}}/J_\ell) + n_\ell}(S/I) = \dim_k (J_\ell^{\text{sat}}/J_\ell)_{s(J_\ell^{\text{sat}}/J_\ell)}.$$

2 Socle of factors by principal $\mathbf{d}$ -fixed ideals.

In the following, we suppose $n \geq 2$.

Lemma 2.1. Let $\mathbf{d} : 1 = d_0 | d_1 | \dots | d_s$, $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}$ and $I = \langle x_n^\alpha \rangle_{\mathbf{d}} = \prod_{t=0}^s (\mathbf{m}^{[d_t]})^{\alpha_t}$. Let $q_t = \sum_{j=t}^s \alpha_j d_j$. Let

$$J = \sum_{t=0, \alpha_t > 0}^s (x_1 \dots x_n)^{d_t-1} (\mathbf{m}^{[d_t]})^{\alpha_t-1} \prod_{j>t} (\mathbf{m}^{[d_j]})^{\alpha_j}.$$

Then:

1. $\text{Soc}(S/I) = \frac{J+I}{I}$
2. Let e be a positive integer. Then $(\frac{J+I}{I})_e \neq 0 \Leftrightarrow e = q_t + (n-1)(d_t-1) - 1$, for some $0 \leq t \leq s$ with $\alpha_t > 0$.

$$3. \max\{e|(\frac{J+I}{I})_e \neq 0\} = \alpha_s d_s + (n-1)(d_s-1) - 1.$$

Proof. 1. First we prove that $\frac{J+I}{I} \subset \text{Soc}(S/I)$. Since $\text{Soc}(S/I) = (O :_{S/I} \mathbf{m})$, it is enough to show that $\mathbf{m}J \subset I$.

We have $J = \sum_{t=0, \alpha_t > 0}^s J_t$, where $J_t = (x_1 \cdots x_n)^{d_t-1} (\mathbf{m}^{[d_t]})^{\alpha_t-1} \prod_{j>t} (\mathbf{m}^{[d_j]})^{\alpha_j}$. It is enough to prove that $x_i J_t \subset I$ for any i and any t . Suppose $i = 1$:

$$x_1 J_t = x_1^{d_t} (x_2 \cdots x_n)^{d_t-1} (\mathbf{m}^{[d_t]})^{\alpha_t-1} \prod_{j>t} (\mathbf{m}^{[d_j]})^{\alpha_j} \subset (x_2 \cdots x_n)^{d_t-1} \prod_{j \geq t} (\mathbf{m}^{[d_j]})^{\alpha_j}.$$

On the other hand, $(x_2 \cdots x_n)^{d_t-1} \in \prod_{j<t} (\mathbf{m}^{[d_j]})^{\alpha_j}$, because $d_t - 1 \geq \sum_{j<t} \alpha_j d_j$. Thus $x_1 J_t \subset I$.

For the converse, we apply induction on α . If $\alpha = 1$ then $s = 0$ and $I = (x_1, \dots, x_n) = \mathbf{m}$. $J = (x_1, \dots, x_n)^{d_0-1} = S$, and obvious $\text{Soc}(S/I) = \text{Soc}(S/\mathbf{m}) = S/\mathbf{m}$. Let us suppose that $\alpha > 1$. We prove that if $w \in S \setminus I$ is a monomial such that $\mathbf{m}w \subset I$, then $w \in J$. Let $t_e = \max\{t : x_e^{d_t-1} | w\}$. Renumbering $x_1, \dots, x_n$ which does not affect either I or J , we may suppose that $t_1 \geq t_2 \geq \dots \geq t_n$. We have two cases: (i) $t_1 > t_n$ and (ii) $t_1 = t_n$. But first, let's make the following remark: (*) If $u = x_1^{\beta_1} \cdots x_n^{\beta_n} \in \prod_{j \geq t} \mathbf{m}^{[d_j]}$ and $\beta_i < d_t$ for certain i then $u/x_i^{\beta_i} \in \prod_{j \geq t} \mathbf{m}^{[d_j]}$ (the proof is similarly to [3, Lemma 3.5]).

In the case (i), there exists an index e such that $t_e > t_{e+1} = \dots = t_n$. Then we have $w = (x_n \cdots x_{e+1})^{d_{t_n}-1} \cdot x_e^{d_{t_e}-1} \cdot y$, for a monomial $y \in S$. We consider two cases (a) x_e does not divide y and (b) x_e divide y . (a) From $x_n w = x_n^{d_{t_n}} \cdot (x_{n-1} \cdots x_{e+1})^{d_{t_n}-1} x_e^{d_{t_e}-1} \cdot y \in I$ we see that $y \in \prod_{j \geq t_e} (\mathbf{m}^{[d_j]})^{\alpha_j}$, by (*). Therefore $w \in I$, because $x_e^{d_{t_e}-1} \in \prod_{j < t_e} (\mathbf{m}^{[d_j]})^{\alpha_j}$, which is an contradiction.

(b) In this case, $w = (x_n \cdots x_{e+1})^{d_{t_n}-1} x_e^{d_{t_e}} y'$, where $y' = y/x_e$. We claim that there exist $\lambda \leq t_e$ such that $\alpha_\lambda \neq 0$. Indeed, if all $\alpha_\lambda = 0$ for $\lambda \leq t_e$, then $I = \prod_{j=t_e+1}^s (\mathbf{m}^{[d_j]})^{\alpha_j}$ and $x_n w \in I$ implies $y' \in I$ because of the maximality of t_n and (*). It follows $w \in I$, which is false. Choose $\lambda \leq t_e$ maximal possible with $\alpha_\lambda \neq 0$. Set $w' = w/x_e^{d_\lambda}$. Note that $\mathbf{m}w \subset I$ implies

$$\mathbf{m}w \subset I' = (\mathbf{m}^{[d_\lambda]})^{\alpha_\lambda-1} \prod_{j \neq \lambda} (\mathbf{m}^{[d_j]})^{\alpha_j}.$$

It is obvious that $x_q w' \in I'$ for $q \neq e$. Also, since $x_e^{d_{t_e}+1}$ does not divide $x_e w$ implies $x_e w' \in I'$. Choosing $\alpha' = \alpha - d_\lambda$, we get $\alpha'_j = \alpha_j$ for $j \neq \lambda$ and $\alpha'_\lambda = \alpha_\lambda - 1$ and therefore we can apply our induction hypothesis for I' (because $\alpha' < \alpha$) and for the ideal J' associated to I' , which has the form:

$$J' = \sum_{q=0, \alpha'_q \neq 0} (x_1 \cdots x_n)^{d_q-1} (\mathbf{m}^{[d_q]})^{\alpha'_q-1} \prod_{j>q} (\mathbf{m}^{[d_j]})^{\alpha'_j},$$

and so $w = x_e^{d_\lambda} w' \in x_e^{d_\lambda} J' \subset J$.

It remains to consider the case (ii) in which we have in fact $t_1 = t_2 = \dots = t_n$. If $y = w/(x_1 \cdots x_n)^{d_{t_n}-1} \in \mathbf{m}$, then there exists e such that $x_e | y$, and we apply our induction hypothesis as in the case (b) above. Thus we may suppose $y = 1$, i.e. $w = (x_1 \cdots x_n)^{d_{t_n}-1}$.

Since $\mathbf{mw} \subset I$, we see that $\alpha_j = 0$ for $j > t_n$ and $\alpha_{t_n} = 1$ (otherwise $w \in I$, which is absurd). Thus $w \in J$.

2. Let $v = x_1^{q_t-1}(x_2 \cdots x_n)^{d_t-1}$. Then $\deg(v) = q_t + (n-1)(d_t-1) - 1$. But $v \in J$ and $v \notin I$, therefore $v \neq 0$ in $\text{Soc}(S/I) = \frac{J+I}{I}$.

3. Let $e_t = q_t + (n-1)(d_t-1) - 1$ for $0 \leq t \leq s$. Let $t < s$. Then

$$e_{t+1} - e_t = q_{t+1} - q_t + (n-1)(d_{t+1} - d_t) = -\alpha_t d_t + (n-1)(d_{t+1} - d_t) \geq d_{t+1} - (\alpha_t + 1)d_t \geq 0, \text{ so}$$

$$\max\{e | ((J+I)/I)_e \neq 0\} = e_s = \alpha_s d_s + (n-1)(d_s - 1) - 1.$$

□

Remark 2.2. From the proof of the above lemma, we may easily conclude that for $n \geq 3$, $e_t = e_{t'}$ if and only if $t = t'$, and if $n = 2$, then $e_t = e_{t'}$ ($t < t'$) if and only if $\alpha_{t'-1} = d_{t'}/d_{t'-1}, \dots, \alpha_t = d_{t+1}/d_t$.

Corollary 2.3. With the notations of previous lemma and remark, let $0 \leq t \leq s$ be an integer such that $\alpha_t \neq 0$. Let $h_t = \dim_K((I + J_t)/I)$. Then:

1. $G(J_t) \cap (I + J_{t'}) = 0$ for $0 \leq t' \leq s$, $t' \neq t$.
2. $h_t = \binom{n+\alpha_t-2}{n-1} \prod_{j>t} \binom{n+\alpha_j-1}{n-1}$.
3. $\dim_K(\text{Soc}(S/I)_e) = \begin{cases} h_q, & \text{if } n \geq 3 \text{ and } e = e_q \text{ for a } q \leq s \text{ with } \alpha_q \neq 0. \\ \sum_q h_q, & \text{if } n = 2 \text{ and } q \in \{e | e = e_e \text{ for } e \leq s \text{ with } \alpha_e \neq 0\}. \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$

Proof. 1. First suppose $t' < t$. A minimal generator $x^\beta = x_1^{\beta_1} \cdots x_n^{\beta_n}$ of J_t has the form

$$(x_1 \cdots x_n)^{d_t-1} \prod_{j \geq t} (x_1^{\lambda_{1j}d_j} \cdots x_n^{\lambda_{nj}d_j}), \text{ where } \sum_{\nu=1}^n \lambda_{\nu j} = \begin{cases} \alpha_j, & \text{if } j > t, \\ \alpha_t - 1, & \text{if } j = t. \end{cases}$$

Thus, $\beta_i = d_t - 1 + \sum_{j=t}^s \lambda_{ij}d_j$. On the other hand, $d_t - 1 = \sum_{j=0}^{t-1} (d_{j+1}/d_j - 1)d_j$, so β_i has the writing $\sum_{j=0}^s \beta_{ij}d_j$, where $\beta_{ij} = d_{j+1}/d_j - 1$ for $j < t$ and $\beta_{ij} = \lambda_{ij}$ for $j \geq t$.

Assume that $x^\beta \in I + J_{t'}$ for a certain $t' < t$. Then there exists $\gamma \in \mathbb{N}^n$ such that $x^\gamma \in G(I)$ (or $x^\gamma \in G(J_{t'})$) and $x^\gamma | x^\beta$, that is $\gamma_i \leq \beta_i$ for all $1 \leq i \leq n$. Let $\gamma_i = \sum_{j=0}^s \gamma_{ij}d_j$, the $\mathbf{d}$ -decomposition of γ_i . We notice that $(\beta_{is}, \dots, \beta_{i0}) \geq (\gamma_{is}, \dots, \gamma_{i0})$ in the lexicographic order.

Note that all minimal generators x^γ of I have the same degree $\alpha < e_t$ and $\sum_{i=1}^n \gamma_{iq} = \alpha_q$ for each $0 \leq q \leq s$. Also all minimal generators x^γ of $J_{t'}$ have the same degree $e_{t'} < e_t$ and $\sum_{i=1}^n \gamma_{iq} = \alpha_q$ for each $t \leq q \leq s$. It follows $\deg(x^\beta) > \deg(x^\gamma)$ and so $\beta_i > \gamma_i$ for some i . Choose a maximal $q < s$ such that $\beta_{iq} > \gamma_{iq}$ for some i . Thus $\beta_{ij} = \gamma_{ij}$ for $j > q$. It follows $\beta_{iq} \geq \gamma_{iq}$ since $(\beta_{is}, \dots, \beta_{i0}) \geq_{lex} (\gamma_{is}, \dots, \gamma_{i0})$. If $q \leq t$ then we have

$$\alpha_q = \sum_{i=1}^n \gamma_{iq} < \sum_{i=1}^n \beta_{iq} = \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_{iq} \leq \alpha_q,$$

which is not possible. It follows $q < t$ and so $\beta_{it} = \gamma_{it}$ for each i . But this is not possible because we get $\alpha_t = \sum_{i=1}^n \gamma_{it} = \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_{it} = \alpha_t - 1$. Hence $x^\beta \notin I + J_{t'}$.

Suppose now $t' > t$. If $e_{t'} > e_t$, then $G(J_t) \cap G(J_{t'}) = \emptyset$ by degree reason. Assume $e_t = e_{t'}$. It follows $n = 2$ by the previous remark. If $x_1^{\beta_1} x_2^{\beta_2} \in G(J_t) \cap J_{t'}$ we necessarily get $x_1^{\beta_1} x_2^{\beta_2} \in G(J_t) \cap G(J_{t'})$ again by degree reason. But this is not possible since it implies that $\alpha_{t'} - 1 = \beta_{1t'} + \beta_{2t'} = \alpha_{t'}$.

2. and 3. follows from 1. □

Theorem 2.4. Let $u = \prod_{q=1}^r x_{i_1}^{\alpha_q}$, where $2 \leq i_1 < i_2 < \dots < i_r \leq n$. Let

$$I = \langle u \rangle_{\mathbf{d}} = \prod_{q=1}^r \prod_{j=0}^s (\mathbf{m}_q^{[d_j]})^{\alpha_{qj}},$$

where $\alpha_q = \sum_{j=0}^s \alpha_{qj} d_j$. Suppose $i_r = n$. Let $1 \leq a \leq r$ be an integer and

$$P_a(I) := \{(\lambda, t) \in \mathbb{N}^a \times \mathbb{N}^a \mid 1 \leq \lambda_1 < \dots < \lambda_a = r, t_a > \dots > t_1, \alpha_{\lambda_\nu t_\nu} \neq 0, \text{ for } 1 \leq \nu \leq a\}.$$

Let $J = \sum_{a=1}^r \sum_{(\lambda, t) \in P_a(I)} J_{(\lambda, t)}$, where $J_{(\lambda, t)}$ is the ideal

$$\prod_{e=1}^a (x_{i_{\lambda_e}} \cdots x_{i_{\lambda_{e-1}+1}})^{d_{t_e}-1} \prod_{\nu=1}^a \mathbf{m}_{\lambda_\nu}^{[d_{t_\nu}+1]} \prod_{j>t_\nu} (\mathbf{m}_{\lambda_\nu}^{[d_j]})^{\alpha_{\lambda_\nu j}} (\mathbf{m}_{\lambda_\nu}^{[d_{t_\nu}]})^{\alpha_{\lambda_\nu, t_\nu}-1} \prod_{q=\lambda_{\nu-1}+1}^{\lambda_\nu-1} \prod_{j \geq t_\nu} (\mathbf{m}_q^{[d_j]})^{\alpha_{qj}},$$

where we denote $\mathbf{m}^{[d_{t_a+1}]} = S$. Then $\text{Soc}(S/I) = (J + I)/I$.

Proof. The proof will be given by induction on r , the case $r = 1$ being done in Lemma 2.1. Suppose that $r > 1$. For $1 \leq q \leq r$, let: $I_q = \prod_{e=1}^q \prod_{j=0}^s (\mathbf{m}_e^{[d_j]})^{\alpha_{ej}}$ and $S_q = k[x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{i_q}]$. For t with $\alpha_{rt} \neq 0$, denote:

$$I^{(t)} = \mathbf{m}_{r-1}^{[d_t]} \prod_{j<t} (\mathbf{m}_{r-1}^{[d_j]})^{\alpha_{r-1,j}} I_{r-2}.$$

Let $J^{(t)}$ be an ideal in S_{r-1} such that $\text{Soc}(S_{r-1}/I^{(t)}) = (J^{(t)} + I^{(t)})/I^{(t)}$. The induction step is given in the following lemma:

Lemma 2.5. Suppose $i_r = n$ and let

$$J = \sum_{t=0, \alpha_{rt} \neq 0} (x_n \cdots x_{i_{r-1}+1})^{d_t-1} \prod_{j>t} (\mathbf{m}_r^{[d_j]})^{\alpha_{rj}} \prod_{j \geq t} (\mathbf{m}_{r-1}^{[d_j]})^{\alpha_{r-1,j}} (\mathbf{m}_r^{[d_t]})^{\alpha_{rt}-1} J^{(t)}.$$

Then $\text{Soc}(S/I) = (J + I)/I$.

Proof. Let $w \in S \setminus I$ be a monomial such that $\mathbf{m}_r w \subset I$. As in the proof of lemma 2.1, we choose for each $1 \leq \rho \leq n$, $e_\rho = \max\{e : x_\rho^{d_e-1} | w\}$. Renumbering variables $\{x_n, \dots, x_{i_{r-1}+1}\}$ (it does not affect I , J and $I^{(t)}$), we may suppose $e_n \leq e_{n-1} \leq \dots \leq e_{i_{r-1}+1}$. Set $t = e_n$. We claim that $\alpha_{rt} \neq 0$. Indeed, if $\alpha_{rt} = 0$ then from $x_n w \in I$ we

get $x_n w / x_n^{d_t-1} \in \tilde{I} = \prod_{j>t} (\mathbf{m}_r^{[d_j]})^{\alpha_{rj}} I_{r-1}$ because $x_n^{d_t-1} \in \prod_{j<t} (\mathbf{m}_r^{[d_j]})^{\alpha_{rj}}$. Since $t = e_n$ is maximal chosen, we get $w / x_n^{d_t-1} \in \tilde{I}$ and so $w \in I$ a contradiction.

Reduction to the case that $x_n^{d_t}$ does not divide w . Suppose that $w = x_n^{d_t} \tilde{w}$ and set

$$\tilde{I} = (\mathbf{m}_r^{[d_t]})^{\alpha_{rt}-1} \prod_{\epsilon \leq 0, \epsilon \neq t} (\mathbf{m}_r^{[d_\epsilon]})^{\alpha_{r\epsilon}} I_{r-1}.$$

We see that $\mathbf{m}w \in I \Leftrightarrow \mathbf{m}\tilde{w} \in \tilde{I}$. Replacing w and I with $\tilde{w}$ and $\tilde{I}$, we reduce our problem to a new $\tilde{t} < t$. The above argument implies that $\tilde{\alpha}_{r\tilde{t}} \neq 0$, where $\tilde{\alpha}$ is the 'new' α of $\tilde{I}$.

Reduction to the case when $\alpha_{rj} = \alpha_{r-1,j} = 0$ for $j > t$, $\alpha_{rt} = 1$ and $\alpha_{r-1,t} = 0$. From $x_n w \in I$, we see that there exists $\rho < n$ such that $x_\rho^{d_j} | w$ for $j > t$ if $\alpha_{rj} \neq 0$, or $j = t$ if $\alpha_{rt} > 1$. Choose such maximal possible ρ . Set $w' = w / x_\rho^{d_j}$,

$$I' = (\mathbf{m}_r^{[d_j]})^{\alpha_{rj}-1} \prod_{\epsilon \geq 0, \epsilon \neq j} (\mathbf{m}_r^{[d_\epsilon]})^{\alpha_{r\epsilon}} I_{r-1}.$$

We see that $\mathbf{m}w \subset I \Leftrightarrow \mathbf{m}w' \subset I'$, because from $x_n w \in I$, we get $x_n w' \in I'$ from the maximality of ρ .

Let $\alpha'_{rj} = \alpha_{rj} - 1$ and $\alpha'_{q\epsilon} = \alpha_{q\epsilon}$ for $(q, \epsilon) \neq (r, j)$. α' is the 'new' α for I' . If we show that

$$w' \in J' = \sum_{e \geq 0, \alpha'_{re} \neq 0} (x_n \cdots x_{i_{r-1}+1})^{d_e-1} \prod_{\epsilon > e} (\mathbf{m}_r^{[d_\epsilon]})^{\alpha_{r\epsilon}} \prod_{j \geq e} (\mathbf{m}_{r-1}^{[d_j]})^{\alpha_{r-1,j}} (\mathbf{m}_r^{[d_\epsilon]})^{\alpha_{re}-1} J^{(t)},$$

then $w = x_\rho^{d_j} w' \in \mathbf{m}_r^{[d_j]} J' \subset J$. Using this procedure, by recurrence we arrive to the case $\alpha_{rj} = 0$ for $j > t$ and $\alpha_{rt} = 1$. Again from $x_n w \in I$, we note that there exists $\rho < i_{r-1}$ such that $x_\rho^{d_j} | w$ for $j \geq t$ with $\alpha_{r-1,j} \neq 0$. Choose such maximal possible ρ and note that $\mathbf{m}w \subset I$ if and only if $\mathbf{m}w'' \in I''$ for $w'' = w / x_\rho^{d_j}$, where

$$I'' = (\mathbf{m}_{r-1}^{[d_j]})^{\alpha_{r-1,j}-1} \prod_{\epsilon \geq 0, \epsilon \neq j} (\mathbf{m}_{r-1}^{[d_\epsilon]})^{\alpha_{r-1,\epsilon}} \prod_{\epsilon \geq 0} (\mathbf{m}_r^{[d_\epsilon]})^{\alpha_{r\epsilon}} I_{r-2}.$$

As above, we reduce our problem to I'' and the α'' , which is the new α of I'' , is given by $\alpha''_{r-1,j} = \alpha_{r-1,j-1}$, $\alpha''_{q\epsilon} = \alpha_{q\epsilon}$ for $(q, \epsilon) \neq (r-1, j)$. Using this procedure, by recurrence we end our reduction.

Case $\alpha_{rj} = \alpha_{r-1,j} = 0$ for $j > t$, $\alpha_{rt} = 1$, $\alpha_{r-1,t} = 0$ and $x_n^{d_t}$ does not divide w . Let express $w = (x_n \cdots x_{i_{r-1}+1})^{d_t-1} y$. We will show that y does not depend on $\{x_n, \dots, x_{i_{r-1}+1}\}$. Indeed, if $n = i_{r-1} + 1$ then there is nothing to show since $x_n^{d_t}$ does not divide w . Suppose that $n > i_{r-1} + 1$, then from $x_n w \in I$ we get $y \in I_{r-1}$ because $x_{n-1}^{d_t-1} \in \prod_{j<t} (\mathbf{m}_r^{[d_j]})^{\alpha_{rj}}$ and the variables $x_n, \dots, x_{i_{r-1}+1}$ are regular on $S/I_{r-1}S$. If $y = x_\eta y'$ for $\eta > i_{r-1}$, then as above $y' \in I_{r-1}$. Thus $w \in x_\eta^{d_t} x_\rho^{d_t-1} y' \subset I$ for any $\rho \neq \eta$, $i_{r-1} < \rho \leq n$, a contradiction.

Note that $\mathbf{m}_r w \in I \Rightarrow \mathbf{m}_{r-1} y \in I^{(t)}$ and so $w \in (x_n \cdots x_{i_{r-1}+1})^{d_t-1} J^{(t)}$. Since $\alpha_{rj} = \alpha_{r-1,j} = 0$ for $j > t$ and $\alpha_{rt} = 1$ and $\alpha_{r-1,t} = 0$, we get $w \in J$. Conversely, if $y \in J^{(t)}$, then it is clear that $w \in J$. $\square$

We see by the above lemma that:

$$(*) \quad J = \sum_{e \geq 0, \alpha_{re} \neq 0} (x_n \cdots x_{i_{r-1}+1})^{d_e-1} \prod_{j > e} (\mathbf{m}_{r-1}^{[d_j]})^{\alpha_{rj}} \prod_{j \geq e} (\mathbf{m}_{r-1}^{[d_j]})^{\alpha_{r-1,j}} (\mathbf{m}_r^{[d_e]})^{\alpha_{re}-1} J^{(e)}.$$

Since $\lambda_a = r - 1$, by the induction hypothesis applied to $I^{(e)}$ we get:

$$\begin{aligned} J^{(e)} &= \sum_{a=1}^{r-1} \left[\sum_{(\lambda, t) \in P_a(I^{(e)}), t_a = e} \prod_{s=1}^a (x_{i_{\lambda_s}} \cdots x_{i_{\lambda_{s-1}+1}})^{d_{t_s}-1} \cdot J'_{(\lambda, t)} + \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \sum_{(\lambda, t) \in P_a(I^{(e)}), t_a < e} \prod_{s=1}^a (x_{i_{\lambda_s}} \cdots x_{i_{\lambda_{s-1}+1}})^{d_{t_s}-1} \cdot J''_{(\lambda, t)} \right], \text{ where} \\ J'_{(\lambda, t)} &= \prod_{q=\lambda_{a-1}+1}^{\lambda_a-1} \prod_{j \geq e} (\mathbf{m}_q^{[d_j]})^{\alpha_{qj}} \tilde{J}_{(\lambda, t)} \text{ and} \\ J''_{(\lambda, t)} &= \mathbf{m}_{r-1}^{[d_e]} \prod_{j > t_a}^{e-1} (\mathbf{m}_{\lambda_a}^{[d_j]})^{\alpha_{\lambda_a, j}} (\mathbf{m}_{\lambda_a}^{[d_{t_a}]})^{\alpha_{\lambda_a, t_a-1}} \cdot \prod_{q=\lambda_{a-1}+1}^{\lambda_a-1} \prod_{j \geq t_a} (\mathbf{m}_q^{[d_j]})^{\alpha_{qj}} \tilde{J}_{(\lambda, t)}, \text{ and} \\ \tilde{J}_{(\lambda, t)} &= \prod_{\nu=1}^{a-1} \mathbf{m}_{\lambda_\nu}^{[d_{t_\nu+1}]} \prod_{j > t_\nu} (\mathbf{m}_{\lambda_\nu}^{[d_j]})^{\alpha_{\lambda_\nu, j}} (\mathbf{m}_{\lambda_\nu}^{[d_{t_\nu}]})^{\alpha_{\lambda_\nu, t_\nu-1}} \cdot \prod_{q=\lambda_{\nu-1}+1}^{\lambda_\nu-1} \prod_{j \geq t_\nu} (\mathbf{m}_q^{[d_j]})^{\alpha_{qj}}. \end{aligned}$$

If $t_a = e$, set $\lambda'_\nu = \lambda_\nu$ for $\nu < a$, $\lambda'_a = r$ and see that $(\lambda', t) \in P_a(I)$. If $t_a < e$, then put $\lambda''_\nu = \lambda_\nu$ for $\nu \leq a$, $\lambda''_{a+1} = r$, $t''_\nu = t_\nu$ for $\nu \leq a$ and $t''_{a+1} = e$ and then $(\lambda'', t) \in P_{a+1}(I)$. Substituting $J^{(e)}$ in $(*)$, we get the following expression for J :

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{a=1}^{r-1} \sum_{(\lambda', t) \in P_a(I)} \prod_{\nu=1}^a (x_{i_{\lambda'_\nu}} \cdots x_{i_{\lambda'_{\nu-1}+1}})^{d_{t_\nu}-1} \cdot \left[\prod_{j > e} (\mathbf{m}_{\lambda'_a}^{[d_j]})^{\alpha_{\lambda'_a, j}} (\mathbf{m}_{\lambda'_a}^{[d_e]})^{\alpha_{\lambda'_a, e}-1} \cdot \prod_{q=\lambda'_{a-1}+1}^{\lambda'_a-1} \prod_{j \geq e} (\mathbf{m}_q^{[d_j]})^{\alpha_{qj}} \right] \\ &\cdot \tilde{J}_{(\lambda, t)} + \sum_{a=1}^{r-1} \sum_{(\lambda'', t'') \in P_{a+1}(I)} \prod_{\nu=1}^{a+1} (x_{i_{\lambda''_\nu}} \cdots x_{i_{\lambda''_{\nu-1}+1}})^{d_{t''_\nu}-1} \cdot \left[\prod_{j > e} (\mathbf{m}_{\lambda''_{a+1}}^{[d_j]})^{\alpha_{\lambda''_{a+1}, j}} (\mathbf{m}_{\lambda''_{a+1}}^{[d_{t''_{a+1}}]})^{\alpha_{\lambda''_{a+1}, t''_{a+1}-1}} \right] \\ &\quad \left[\mathbf{m}_{\lambda''_a}^{[d_{t''_a+1}]} \prod_{j \geq t''_a} (\mathbf{m}_{\lambda''_a}^{[d_j]})^{\alpha_{\lambda''_a, j}} (\mathbf{m}_{\lambda''_a}^{[d_{t''_a}]})^{\alpha_{\lambda''_a, t''_a-1}} \prod_{q=\lambda''_{a-1}+1}^{\lambda''_a-1} \prod_{j \geq t''_a} (\mathbf{m}_q^{[d_j]})^{\alpha_{qj}} \right] \cdot \tilde{J}_{(\lambda, t)}. \end{aligned}$$

Since all the pairs of $P_b(I)$ have the form (λ', t) or (λ'', t'') for a pair $(\lambda, t) \in P_b(I)$ or $(\lambda, t) \in P_{b-1}(I)$ respectively, it is not hard to see that the expression above is the formula of J as stated. $\square$

Let $s_q = \max\{j | \alpha_{qj} \neq 0\}$, $d_{qt} = \sum_{e=1}^q \sum_{j \geq t}^{s_q} \alpha_{ej} d_j$, $D_q = d_{q, s_q} + (i_q - 1)(d_{s_q} - 1)$ for $1 \leq q \leq r$.

Corollary 2.6. *With the notation and hypothesis of above theorem, for $(\lambda, t) \in P_a(I)$ let:*

$$d_{(\lambda, t)} = \sum_{\nu=1}^a \sum_{q=\lambda_{\nu-1}+1}^{\lambda_{\nu}} \sum_{j \geq t_{\nu}} \alpha_{qj} d_j. \text{ Then :}$$

1. $\text{Soc}(I_{r-1}S/I) = \text{Soc}(S/I)$.
2. $((J+I)/I)_e \neq 0$, if and only if $e = d_{(\lambda, t)} + \sum_{\nu=1}^a (i_{\lambda_{\nu}} - i_{\lambda_{\nu-1}})(d_{t_{\nu}} - 1) - d_{t_1}$, for some $1 \leq a \leq r$ and $(\lambda, t) \in P_a(I)$.
3. $c = \max\{e | ((J+I)/I)_e \neq 0\} = d_{r, s_r} + (n-1)(d_{s_r} - 1) - 1$.

Proof. 1. Note that $J_{(\lambda, t)}$ is contained in

$$\prod_{q=1, q \notin \{\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_r\}}^r (\mathbf{m}_q^{[d_j]})^{\alpha_{qj}} \prod_{\nu=1}^a \left[\prod_{j \neq t_{\nu}} (\mathbf{m}_{\lambda_{\nu}}^{d_j})^{\alpha_{\lambda_{\nu}, j}} (\mathbf{m}_{\lambda_{\nu}}^{t_{\nu}})^{\alpha_{\lambda_{\nu}, t_{\nu}-1}} \right] \prod_{\epsilon=1}^{a-1} \mathbf{m}_{\lambda_{\epsilon+1}}^{d_{t_{\epsilon}}+1}.$$

Since $\mathbf{m}_{\lambda_{\epsilon}}^{d_{t_{\epsilon}+1}} \subset \mathbf{m}_{\lambda_{\epsilon}}^{d_{t_{\epsilon}}}$ for $t_{\epsilon+1} > t_{\epsilon}$ and $\lambda_a = r$ it follows that

$$J \subset \prod_{j \neq t_a} (\mathbf{m}_r^{[d_j]})^{\alpha_{rj}} (\mathbf{m}_r^{[d_{t_a}]})^{\alpha_{rt_a}-1} I_{r-1},$$

as desired.

2. If $((J+I)/I)_e \neq 0$ then there exists a monomial $u \in J \setminus I$ of degree e . But $u \in J$, implies that there exists $a \in \{1, \dots, r\}$ and $(\lambda, t) \in P_a(I)$ such that $u \in J_{(\lambda, t)}$. Thus the degree of u is $e = d_{(\lambda, t)} + \sum_{\nu=1}^a (i_{\lambda_{\nu}} - i_{\lambda_{\nu-1}})(d_{t_{\nu}} - 1) - d_{t_1}$, as required.

Conversely, let $e = d_{(\lambda, t)} + \sum_{\nu=1}^a (i_{\lambda_{\nu}} - i_{\lambda_{\nu-1}})(d_{t_{\nu}} - 1) - d_{t_1}$ for some $a \in \{1, \dots, r\}$ and $(\lambda, t) \in P_a(I)$. We show that the monomial

$$w = \prod_{\nu=1}^a (x_{i_{\lambda_{\nu}}} \cdots x_{i_{\lambda_{\nu-1}+1}})^{d_{t_{\nu}}-1} \cdot x_1^{d_{(\lambda, t)}-d_{t_1}} \in J \setminus I.$$

Obvious $w \in J$. Let us assume that $w \notin I$. Then $w/x_{i_{\lambda_a}}^{d_{t_a}-1} \in \prod_{j \geq t_a} (\mathbf{m}_{\lambda_a}^{[d_j]})^{\alpha_{\lambda_a j}} I_{\lambda_a-1}$ because $x_{i_{\lambda_a}}^{d_{t_a}-1} \in \prod_{j < t_a} (\mathbf{m}_{\lambda_a}^{[d_j]})^{\alpha_{\lambda_a j}}$ and $x_{i_{\lambda_a}} \notin \mathbf{m}_j$ for $j < \lambda_a$. Inductively we get that:

$$w/(x_{i_{\lambda_a}} \cdots x_{i_{\lambda_{a-1}+1}})^{d_{t_a}-1} \in \prod_{q=\lambda_{a-1}+1}^{\lambda_a} \prod_{j \geq t_a} (\mathbf{m}_{\lambda_a}^{[d_j]})^{\alpha_{qj}} I_{\lambda_a-1}.$$

Following the same reduction and using that $t_a > \dots > t_1$ we obtain that:

$$x_1^{d_{(\lambda, t)}-d_{t_1}} \in \prod_{\nu=1}^a \prod_{q=\lambda_{\nu-1}+1}^{\lambda_{\nu}} \prod_{j \geq t_{\nu}} (\mathbf{m}_{\lambda_a}^{[d_j]})^{\alpha_{qj}}.$$

So $d_{(\lambda,t)} - d_{t_1} \geq d_{(\lambda,t)}$, a contradiction.

3. Note that $c = d_{(\lambda',t')}$ for $(\lambda',t') \in P_1(I)$ with $\lambda' = \lambda_1 = r$ and $t' = t_1 = s_r$. We have to show that:

$$c = d_{r,s_r} + (n-1)(d_{s_r} - 1) - 1 \leq d_{(\lambda,t)} + \sum_{\nu=1}^a (i_{\lambda_\nu} - i_{\lambda_{\nu-1}})(d_{t_\nu} - 1) - d_{t_1},$$

for any $1 \leq a \leq r$ and $(\lambda, t) \in P_a(I)$. Since $d_{s_r} - 1 \leq (d_{t_\nu} - 1) + \sum_{j \leq t_\nu}^{s_r-1} \alpha_{qj} d_j$ for all q with $i_{\nu-1} < q \leq i_\nu$, we see that:

$$d_{r,s_r} + (n-1)(d_{s_r} - 1) - 1 \geq d_{(\lambda,t)} + \sum_{\nu=2}^a (i_{\lambda_\nu} - i_{\lambda_{\nu-1}})(d_{t_\nu} - 1) + (i_{\lambda_1} - 1)(d_{t_1} - 1) - 1.$$

On the other hand, $(i_{\lambda_1} - i_{\lambda_0})(d_{t_1} - 1) = (i_{\lambda_1} - 1)(d_{t_1} - 1) + d_{t_1} - 1$, and replacing that in the above relation we obtained what is required. $\square$

Example 2.7. Let $\mathbf{d} : 1|2|4|12$.

1. Let $u = x_3^{21}$. We have $\alpha_0 = 1$, $\alpha_1 = 0$, $\alpha_2 = 2$ and $\alpha_3 = 1$ so:

$$I = \langle u \rangle_{\mathbf{d}} = (x_1, x_2, x_3)(x_1^4, x_2^4, x_3^4)^2(x_1^{12}, x_2^{12}, x_3^{12}).$$

Let $J = \sum_{t=0, \alpha_t > 0} J_t$, where $J_t = (x_1 x_2 x_3)^{d_t-1} (x_1^{d_t}, x_2^{d_t}, x_3^{d_t})^{\alpha_t-1} \prod_{j>t} (x_1^{d_j}, x_2^{d_j}, x_3^{d_j})^{\alpha_j}$.

$$J_0 = (x_1 x_2 x_3)^{1-1} \cdot (x_1, x_2, x_3)^{1-1} \cdot \prod_{j>0} (x_1^{d_j}, x_2^{d_j}, x_3^{d_j})^{\alpha_j} = (x_1^4, x_2^4, x_3^4)^2 (x_1^{12}, x_2^{12}, x_3^{12}).$$

$$J_2 = (x_1 x_2 x_3)^{4-1} (x_1^4, x_2^4, x_3^4)^{2-1} (x_1^{12}, x_2^{12}, x_3^{12}) = (x_1 x_2 x_3)^3 (x_1^4, x_2^4, x_3^4) (x_1^{12}, x_2^{12}, x_3^{12}) \text{ and}$$

$$J_3 = (x_1 x_2 x_3)^{12-1} = (x_1 x_2 x_3)^{11}. \text{ From 2.1, } \text{Soc}(S/I) = (J + I)/I.$$

2. Let $u = x_2^9 x_3^{16}$. We have $r = 2$, $i_1 = 2$ and $i_2 = 3$. Also $\alpha_{10} = 1$, $\alpha_{12} = 2$, $\alpha_{22} = 1$, $\alpha_{23} = 1$ and the other components of α are zero. Then

$$I = \langle u \rangle_{\mathbf{d}} = \langle x_2^9 \rangle_{\mathbf{d}} \langle x_3^{16} \rangle_{\mathbf{d}} = (x_1, x_2)(x_1^4, x_2^4)^2 (x_1^4, x_2^4, x_3^4) (x_1^{12}, x_2^{12}, x_3^{12}).$$

We have two possible partitions: (a) (2) and (b) (1 < 2).

(a) $\lambda = \lambda_1 = 2$, $t = t_1$ such that $\alpha_{2t} \neq 0$. We have two possible t : $t = 2$ or $t = 3$.

(i) For $t = 2$ we obtain (according to the Theorem 2.4) the following part of the socle:

$$J_{(2,2)} = (x_1 x_2 x_3)^3 (x_1^{12}, x_2^{12}, x_3^{12}) (x_1^4, x_2^4)^4$$

(ii) For $t = 3$ we obtain:

$$J_{(2,3)} = (x_1 x_2 x_3)^{11}$$

(b) $1 = \lambda_1 < \lambda_2 = 2$, $t = (t_1, t_2)$ such that $\alpha_{\lambda_e, t_e} \neq 0$ for $1 \leq e \leq 2$ and $t_1 < t_2$. According to our expressions for α_i we have three possible cases: $t_1 = 0, t_2 = 2$ or $t_1 = 0, t_2 = 3$ or $t_1 = 2, t_2 = 3$.

(i) For $t_1 = 0$ and $t_2 = 2$ we obtain:

$$J_{(1,2),(0,2)} = x_3^3(x_1^4, x_2^4)(x_1^4, x_2^4)^2(x_1^{12}, x_2^{12}, x_3^{12}).$$

(ii) For $t_1 = 0$ and $t_2 = 3$ we obtain:

$$J_{(1,2),(0,3)} = x_3^{11}(x_1^{12}, x_2^{12})(x_1^4, x_2^4)^2$$

(iii) For $t_1 = 2$ and $t_2 = 3$ we obtain:

$$J_{(1,2),(2,3)} = x_1^3 x_2^3 x_3^{11}(x_1^{12}, x_2^{12})(x_1^4, x_2^4)$$

From 2.4 it follows that if $J = J_{(2,2)} + J_{(2,3)} + J_{(1,2),(0,2)} + J_{(1,2),(0,3)} + J_{(1,2),(2,3)}$ then $\text{Soc}(S/I) = (I + J)/J$.

3 A generalization of Pardue's formula.

In this section, we give a generalization of a theorem proved by Aramova-Herzog [1] and Herzog-Popescu [4] which is known as "Pardue's formula".

Let $1 \leq i_1 < i_2 < \dots < i_r = n$ and let $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_r$ some positive integers. Let $u = \prod_{i=1}^r x_{i_q}^{\alpha_q} \in S = K[x_1, \dots, x_n]$. Our goal is to give a formula for the regularity of the ideal

$$I = \langle u \rangle_{\mathbf{d}} = \prod_{r=1}^q \prod_{j=0}^s (\mathbf{m}_q^{[d_j]})^{\alpha_{qj}},$$

where $\alpha_q = \sum_{j=0}^s \alpha_{qj} d_j$. If $i_1 = 1$, it follows that $I = x_1^{\alpha_1} I'$, where $I' = \prod_{r=2}^q \prod_{j=0}^s (\mathbf{m}_q^{[d_j]})^{\alpha_{qj}}$, and therefore $\text{reg}(I) = \alpha_1 + \text{reg}(I')$. Thus, we may assume $i_1 \geq 2$.

If N is a graded S -module of finite length, we denote $s(N) = \max\{i | N_i \neq 0\}$. Let $s_q = \max\{j | \alpha_{qj} \neq 0\}$ and $d_{qt} = \sum_{e=1}^q \sum_{j \geq t}^{s_e} \alpha_{ej} d_j$. Let $D_q = d_{qs_q} + (i_q - 1)(d_{s_q} - 1)$, for $1 \leq q \leq r$. With this notations we have:

Theorem 3.1. $\text{reg}(I) = \max_{1 \leq q \leq r} D_q$. In particular, if $I = \langle x_n^\alpha \rangle_{\mathbf{d}}$ and $\alpha = \sum_{t=0}^s \alpha_t d_t$ with $\alpha_s \neq 0$ then $\text{reg}(I) = \alpha_s d_s + (n - 1)(d_s - 1)$.

Proof. Let $I_\ell = \prod_{q=1}^{r-\ell} \prod_{j=0}^s (\mathbf{m}_q^{[d_j]})^{\alpha_{qj}}$, for $0 \leq \ell \leq r$. Then $I = I_0 \subset I_1 \subset \dots \subset I_r = S$ is the sequential chain of ideals of I , i.e. $I_{\ell+1} = (I_\ell : x_{n_\ell}^\infty)$, where $n_\ell = i_{r-\ell}$. Moreover, from the Remark 1.13, we see that this chain is in fact the chain from the definition of a sequentially Cohen-Macaulay module for S/I . Let $S_\ell = k[x_1, \dots, x_{n_\ell}]$ and $m_\ell = (x_1, \dots, x_{n_\ell})$.

The corollary 2.6 implies that $c_e = D_e - 1$ is the maximal degree for a nonzero element of $\text{Soc}(S_\ell/J_\ell)$. [3, Corollary 2.7] implies $\text{reg}(I) = \max\{s(I_\ell S_\ell^{\text{sat}}/I_\ell S_\ell) \mid \ell = 0, \dots, r-1\} + 1$. Also, from the corollary 2.6, we get

$$\text{Soc}(S_\ell/I_\ell S_\ell) = \text{Soc}(I_{\ell+1} S_\ell/I_\ell S_\ell) = (I_{\ell+1} : m_\ell) S_\ell/I_\ell S_\ell = I_\ell S_\ell^{\text{sat}}/I_\ell S_\ell,$$

which complete the proof. $\square$

Corollary 3.2. $\text{reg}(I) \leq n \cdot \deg(u) = n \cdot \deg(I)$, where $\deg(I) = \max\{\deg(w) | w \in G(I)\}$.

Corollary 3.3. S/I has at most r -corners among $(i_q, D_q - 1)$ for $1 \leq q \leq r$. If $i_1 = 1$ we replace $(i_1, D_1 - 1)$ with $(1, \alpha_1)$. The corresponding extremal Betti numbers are $\beta_{i_q, D_q + i_q - 1}$.

Proof. By Theorem 1.14 combined with the proof of Theorem 3.1, S/I has at most r -corners among $(n_\ell, s(I_{\ell+1}S_\ell/I_\ell S_\ell))$ and is enough to apply Corollary 2.6. $\square$

Example 3.4. Let $\mathbf{d} : 1|2|4|12$.

1. Let $u = x_3^{21} \in k[x_1, x_2, x_3]$. We have $21 = 1 \cdot 1 + 0 \cdot 2 + 2 \cdot 4 + 1 \cdot 12$. From 3.1, we get:

$$\text{reg}(\langle u \rangle_{\mathbf{d}}) = 1 \cdot 12 + (3 - 1) \cdot (12 - 1) = 34.$$

2. Let $u = x_1^2 x_2^{16} x_3^9$. Then $\text{reg}(\langle u \rangle_{\mathbf{d}}) = 2 + \text{reg}(\langle u' \rangle_{\mathbf{d}})$, where $u' = u/x_1^2$. We compute $\text{reg}(\langle u' \rangle_{\mathbf{d}})$. With the notations above, we have $i_1 = 2$, $i_2 = 3$, $r = 2$, $\alpha_1 = 16$ and $\alpha_2 = 9$. We have $\alpha_1 = 1 \cdot 4 + 1 \cdot 12$ and $\alpha_2 = 1 \cdot 1 + 2 \cdot 4$, thus $s_1 = 3$ and $s_2 = 2$. $D_1 = d_{13} + (2 - 1)(d_3 - 1) = 12 + 11 = 23$ and $D_2 = d_{22} + (3 - 1)(d_2 - 1) = 24 + 6 = 30$. In conclusion, $\text{reg}(\langle u \rangle_{\mathbf{d}}) = 2 + \max\{23, 30\} = 32$.

In the following, we show that if I is a principal $\mathbf{d}$ -fixed ideal generated by the power of a variable, then $I_{\geq e}$ is stable for any $e \geq \text{reg}(I)$.

Lemma 3.5. Let $I = \langle x_n^\alpha \rangle_{\mathbf{d}}$ and $\alpha = \sum_{t=0}^s \alpha_t d_t$ with $\alpha_s \neq 0$. If $e \geq \text{reg}(I) + 1$ then for every monomial $v \in I_{\geq e}$ there exists $w \in G(I)$ and a monomial $y \in S$ such that $v = w \cdot y$ and $m(v) = m(y)$.

Proof. We may assume $e = \text{reg}(I) + 1$ and $v \in I_e$. Then $v = w' \cdot y'$ for some $w' \in G(I)$ and a monomial $y' \in S$. Suppose $w' = \prod_{t=0}^s \prod_{j=1}^n x_j^{\lambda_{tj} \cdot d_t}$, where $0 \leq \lambda_{tj}$ and $\sum_{j=1}^n \lambda_{tj} = \alpha_t$. Suppose $n = m(v) = m(w') > m(y')$. Then $y' = x_1^{\beta_1} \cdots x_{n-1}^{\beta_{n-1}}$. Let $m = \min\{t | \lambda_{tn} \neq 0\}$.

We claim that there exists some $1 \leq i \leq n$ such that $d_m - \sum_{t=0}^{m-1} \lambda_{ti} d_t \leq \beta_i$. Otherwise, it follows that $d_m - \sum_{t=0}^{m-1} \lambda_{ti} d_t \geq \beta_i + 1$ for any $i = 1, \dots, n-1$. So,

$$(n-1)d_m - \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \sum_{t=0}^{m-1} \lambda_{ti} d_t \geq \beta_1 + \cdots + \beta_{n-1} + n-1 = \text{reg}(I) + 1 - \alpha + n-1 \Leftrightarrow$$

$$(n-1)(d_m - 1) - \sum_{t=0}^{m-1} \alpha_t d_t \geq (n-1)(d_s - 1) - \sum_{t=0}^{s-1} \alpha_t d_t + 1 \Leftrightarrow$$

$$\sum_{t=m}^{s-1} \alpha_t d_t \geq (n-1)(d_s - d_m) + 1,$$

because $\text{reg}(I) = \alpha_s d_s + (n-1)(d_s - 1)$ from Theorem 3.1. But on the other hand, $d_s - d_m = \sum_{t=m}^{s-1} (d_{t+1}/d_t - 1)d_t \geq \sum_{t=m}^{s-1} \alpha_t d_t$ and this contradict the above inequality.

Thus, we may choose $i < n$ such that $\gamma = d_m - \sum_{t=0}^{m-1} \lambda_{ti} d_t \leq \beta_i$. Therefore, we can write: $v = w' \cdot y' = w \cdot y$, where $w = w' \cdot x_i^\gamma / x_n^\gamma$ and $y = w' \cdot x_n^\gamma / x_i^\gamma$. It is easy to see that $w \in G(I)$ and $m(v) = m(y) = n$. $\square$

Corollary 3.6. *If $I = \langle x_n^\alpha \rangle_{\mathbf{d}}$ and $e \geq \text{reg}(I)$ then $I_{\geq e}$ is stable.*

Proof. Let $v \in I_{\geq e}$. Let $i < m(v)$. Since $x_i \cdot v \in I_{\geq e+1}$ it follows from the above lemma that $x_i v = w \cdot y$ for some $w \in G(I)$ and $y \in S$ such that $m(x_i v) = m(y)$. But $m(v) = m(x_i v)$ and thus $x_i v / x_{m(v)} = w \cdot y / x_{m(v)} \in I$. $\square$

The converse is also true. Indeed we have the following more general result of Eisenbud-Reeves-Totaro:

Proposition 3.7. *[2, Proposition 12] Let I be a monomial ideal with $\deg(I) = d$ and let $e \geq d$ such that $I_{\geq e}$ is stable. Then $\text{reg}(I) \leq e$.*

Remark 3.8. *3.6 gives another proof for the " $\leq$ " inequality of the generalised Pardue's formula in the case when $I = \langle x_n^\alpha \rangle_{\mathbf{d}}$. Indeed, considering $e = \alpha_s d_s + (n-1)(d_s-1)$ from 3.6 it follows that $I_{\geq e}$ is stable and thus 3.7 implies $\text{reg}(I) \leq e$.*

Corollary 3.9. *If $I = \langle x_n^\alpha \rangle_{\mathbf{d}}$ then $\text{reg}(I) = \min\{e \mid I_{\geq e} \text{ is stable} \}$.*

References

- [1] Annetta Aramova, Jürgen Herzog "p-Borel principal ideals", Illinois J.Math.41,no 1.(1997),103-121.
- [2] D.Eisenbud, A.Reeves, B.Totaro "Initial ideals, veronese subrings and rates of algebras", Adv.Math. 109 (1994), 168-187.
- [3] Jürgen Herzog, Dorin Popescu, Marius Vladioiu "On the Ext-Modules of ideals of Borel type", Contemporary Math. 331 (2003), 171-186.
- [4] Jürgen Herzog, Dorin Popescu "On the regularity of p-Borel ideals", Proceed.of AMS, Volume 129, no.9, 2563-2570.
- [5] Keith Pardue, "Non standard Borel fixed ideals", Dissertation, Brandeis University, 1994.
- [6] Dorin Popescu "Extremal Betti numbers and regularity of Borel type ideals", Bull. Math. Soc. Sc. Math. Roum. 48(96), no 1, (2005), 65-72.

Mircea Cimpoeaş, Junior Researcher
Institute of Mathematics of the Romanian Academy
Bucharest, Romania
E-mail: mircea.cimpoeas@imar.ro